arXiv:cs/0010011v1 [cs.CC] 6 Oct 2000

If P $\neq$ NP then Some Strongly Noninvertible Functions are Invertible

Lane A. Hemaspaandra [*]
University of Rochester

Kari Pasanen [†]
Nokia Networks and University of Jyväskylä

Jörg Rothe [‡]
Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf

October 6, 2000

Abstract

Rabi, Rivest, and Sherman alter the standard notion of noninvertibility to a new notion they call strong noninvertibility, and show—via explicit cryptographic protocols for secret-key agreement ([RS93,RS97] attribute this to Rivest and Sherman) and digital signatures [RS93,RS97]—that strongly noninvertible functions would be very useful components in protocol design. Their definition of strong noninvertibility has a small twist ("respecting the argument given") that is needed to ensure cryptographic usefulness. In this paper, we show that this small twist has a large, unexpected consequence: Unless P = NP, some strongly noninvertible functions are invertible.

Topic: Computational and Structural Complexity.

1 Introduction

Rabi, Rivest, and Sherman developed novel cryptographic protocols that require one-way functions with algebraic properties such as associativity (see [RS93,RS97] and the attributions and references therein, esp. [She86,KRS88]). Motivated by these protocols, they initiated the study of two-argument (2-ary, for short) one-way functions in worst-case cryptography. To preclude certain types of attacks, their protocols require one-way functions that are not invertible in polynomial time even when the adversary is given not just the function's output but also one of the function's inputs. Calling this property of one-way functions

[*]Department of Computer Science, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627, USA. Email: lane@cs.rochester.edu. Supported in part by grants NSF-CCR-9322513 and NSF-INT-9815095/DAAD-315-PPP-gü-ab. Work done in part while visiting the University of Würzburg.

[†]Nokia Networks, P.O. Box 12, FIN-40101 Jyväskylä, Finland. Email: kari.pasanen@nokia.com.

[‡]Abteilung für Informatik, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany. Email: rothe@informatik.uni-jena.de. Supported in part by grant NSF-INT-9815095/DAAD-315-PPP-gü-ab and a Heisenberg Fellowship of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

"strong noninvertibility" (or "strongness," for short), they left as an open problem whether there is any evidence—e.g., any plausible complexity-theoretic hypothesis—ensuring the existence of one-way functions with all the properties the protocols require, namely ensuring the existence of total, commutative, associative one-way functions that are strongly noninvertible. This problem was recently solved by Hemaspaandra and Rothe [HR99] who show that if P $\neq$ NP then such one-way functions do exist.

Unfortunately, Hemaspaandra and Rothe [HR99] write: "Rabi and Sherman [RS97] also introduce the notion of *strong* one-way functions—2-ary one-way functions that are hard to invert even if one of their arguments is given. Strongness implies one-way-ness." The latter sentence could be very generously read as meaning "strong, one-way functions" when it speaks of "strongness," especially since strongness alone, by definition, does not even require honesty, and without honesty the sentence quoted above would be provably, trivially, false. However, a more natural reading is that [HR99] is assuming that strongly noninvertible functions are always noninvertible. The main result of the present paper is that if P $\neq$ NP then this is untrue. So, even when one has proven a function to be strongly noninvertible, one must not merely claim that noninvertibility automatically holds (as it may not), but rather one must prove the noninvertibility.[1]

In the present paper, we study appropriately honest, polynomial-time computable 2-ary functions. We prove that if P $\neq$ NP then there exist strongly noninvertible such functions that are invertible (see Section 2 for precise definitions). This is a rather surprising result that at first might seem paradoxical. To paint a full picture of what happens if P $\neq$ NP, we also show the (nonsurprising) result that if P $\neq$ NP then there exist appropriately honest, polynomial-time computable 2-ary functions that are noninvertible, yet not strongly noninvertible.

So, why is the surprising, paradoxical-seeming result (that if P $\neq$ NP then some strongly noninvertible functions are invertible) even possible? Let us informally explain. Let σ be a 2-ary function. We say σ is noninvertible if there is no polynomial-time inverter that, given an image element z of σ, outputs some preimage of z. We say σ is strongly noninvertible if even when, in addition to any image element z of σ, one argument of σ is given such that there exists another string with which this argument is mapped to z, computing one such other argument is not a polynomial-time task. So, why does strongness alone not outright imply noninvertibility? One might be tempted to think that from some given polynomial-time inverter g witnessing the invertibility of σ one could construct polynomial-time inverters g_1 and g_2 such that g_i inverts σ in polynomial time even when the ith argument is given (see Definition 2.2 for the formal details). This approach does not work. In particular, it is not clear how to define g_1 when given an output z of σ and a first argument a that together with a corresponding second argument is mapped to z, yet a is not the first component

[1]Since in [HR99] only strong noninvertibility is explicitly proven, one might worry that the functions constructed in its proofs may be invertible. Fortunately, the constructions in the proofs in [HR99] do easily support and implicitly give noninvertibility as well; thus, all the claims of [HR99] remain correct. Most crucially, on page 654 of [HR99], inverting the output $\langle x, x\rangle$ in polynomial time would give strings containing one witness for membership of x in the given set in NP $-$ P (if there are any such witnesses), which is impossible.

of $g(z)$. (In fact, our main theorem implies that *no* approach can in general accomplish the desired transformation from g to g_1, unless P = NP.)

But then, why don't we use a different notion of strongness that automatically implies noninvertibility? The answer is that the definitional subtlety that opens the door to the unexpected behavior is absolutely essential to the cryptographic protocols for which Rabi, Rivest, and Sherman created the notion in the first place. For example, suppose one were tempted to redefine "strongly noninvertible" with the following quite different notion: σ is "strongly noninvertible" if, given any image element z of σ and any one argument of σ such that there exists another string with which this argument is mapped to z, computing *any preimage of* z (as opposed to "any other argument respecting the argument given") is not a polynomial-time task. The problem with this redefinition is that it completely loses the core of why strongness precludes direct attacks against the protocols of Rabi, Rivest, and Sherman. We will call the just-defined notion "overstrongness," as it seems to be overrestrictive in terms of motivation—and we will prove that if P $\neq$ NP then overstrongness indeed is a properly more restrictive notion than strongness.

2 Definitions

Fix the binary alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$. Let ϵ denote the empty string. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ be some standard pairing function, that is, some total, polynomial-time computable bijection that has polynomial-time computable inverses and is nondecreasing in each argument when the other argument is fixed. Let FP denote the set of all polynomial-time computable total functions. The standard definition of one-way-ness used here is essentially due to Grollmann and Selman [GS88] (except that they require one-way functions to be one-to-one); as in the papers [RS97,HR99,Hom00], their notion is tailored below to the case of 2-ary functions.

Definition 2.1 [GS88,RS97,HR99] *Let $\rho : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ be any (possibly nontotal, possibly many-to-one) 2-ary function.*

1. *We say ρ is* honest *if and only if there exists a polynomial q such that:*

$$(\forall z \in \text{image}(\rho))\,(\exists (a, b) \in \text{domain}(\rho))\,[|a| + |b| \leq q(|z|) \wedge \rho(a, b) = z].$$

2. *We say ρ is* (polynomial-time) noninvertible *if and only if the following does not hold:*

$$(\exists g \in \text{FP})\,(\forall z \in \text{image}(\rho))\,[\rho(g(z)) = z].$$

3. *We say ρ is* one-way *if and only if it is honest, polynomial-time computable, and noninvertible.*

We now define strong noninvertibility (or strongness), which is a stand-alone property (i.e., with one-way-ness not necessarily required) of 2-ary functions. If one wants to discuss

strongness in a nontrivial way, one needs some type of honesty that is suitable for strongness. To this end, we introduce below, in addition to honesty as defined above, the notion of s-honesty.[2]

Definition 2.2 (see, essentially, [RS97,HR99]) *Let $\sigma : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ be any (possibly nontotal, possibly many-to-one) 2-ary function.*

1. *We say σ is* s-honest *if and only if there exists a polynomial q such that both* (a) *and* (b) *hold:*

   (a) $(\forall z, a : (\exists b)\,[\sigma(a,b) = z])\,(\exists b')\,[|b'| \leq q(|z| + |a|) \wedge \sigma(a,b') = z]$.

   (b) $(\forall z, b : (\exists a)\,[\sigma(a,b) = z])\,(\exists a')\,[|a'| \leq q(|z| + |b|) \wedge \sigma(a',b) = z]$.

2. *We say σ is* (polynomial-time) invertible with respect to the first argument *if and only if*

   $$(\exists g_1 \in \mathrm{FP})\,(\forall z \in \mathrm{image}(\sigma))\,(\forall a, b : (a,b) \in \mathrm{domain}(\sigma) \wedge \sigma(a,b) = z)$$
   $$[\sigma(a, g_1(\langle a, z\rangle)) = z].$$

3. *We say σ is* (polynomial-time) invertible with respect to the second argument *if and only if*

   $$(\exists g_2 \in \mathrm{FP})\,(\forall z \in \mathrm{image}(\sigma))\,(\forall a, b : (a,b) \in \mathrm{domain}(\sigma) \wedge \sigma(a,b) = z)$$
   $$[\sigma(g_2(\langle b, z\rangle), b) = z].$$

4. *We say σ is* strongly noninvertible *if and only if σ is neither invertible with respect to the first argument nor invertible with respect to the second argument.*

5. *We say σ is* strongly one-way *if and only if it is s-honest, polynomial-time computable, and strongly noninvertible.*

It is easy to see that there are honest, polynomial-time computable 2-ary functions that are not s-honest,[3] and that there are s-honest, polynomial-time computable 2-ary functions that are not honest.[4]

For completeness, we also give a formal definition of the notion of overstrongness mentioned in the last paragraph of the introduction. Note that overstrongness implies both noninvertibility and strong noninvertibility.

[2]The strongly noninvertible functions in [HR99] clearly are all s-honest, notwithstanding that s-honesty is not explicitly discussed in [HR99] (or [RS97,RS93]).

[3]For example, consider the function $\rho : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ defined by $\rho(a,b) = 1^{\lceil \log\log(\max(|b|,2))\rceil}$ if $a = 0$, and $\rho(a,b) = ab$ if $a \neq 0$. This function is honest (as proven by $\rho(\epsilon, x) = x$) but is not s-honest, since for any given polynomial q there are strings $b \in \Sigma^*$ and $z = 1^{\lceil \log\log(\max(|b|,2))\rceil}$ with $\rho(0,b) = z$, but the smallest $b' \in \Sigma^*$ with $\rho(0,b') = z$ satisfies $|b'| > q(|z| + |0|) = q(\lceil \log\log(\max(|b|,2))\rceil + 1)$.

[4]For example, consider the function $\sigma : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ that is defined by $\sigma(a,b) = 1^{\lceil \log\log(\max(|a|,2))\rceil}$ if $|a| = |b|$, and that is undefined otherwise. This function is s-honest but not honest.

Definition 2.3 *Let $\sigma : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ be any (possibly nontotal, possibly many-to-one) 2-ary function. We say σ is* overstrong *if and only if for no $f \in$ FP with $f : \{1,2\} \times \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$ does it hold that for each $i \in \{1,2\}$ and for all strings $z, a \in \Sigma^*$:*

$$((\exists b \in \Sigma^*)[(\sigma(a,b) = z \wedge i = 1) \vee (\sigma(b,a) = z \wedge i = 2)]) \implies \sigma(f(i,z,a)) = z.$$

3 On Inverting Strongly Noninvertible Functions

It is well-known (see, e.g., [Sel92,BDG95]) that 1-ary one-way functions exist if and only if P $\neq$ NP; as mentioned in [HR99,RS97], the standard method to prove this result can also be used to prove the analogous result for 2-ary one-way functions.

Theorem 3.1 (see [HR99,RS97]) P $\neq$ NP *if and only if total 2-ary one-way functions exist.*

Now we show the main, and most surprising, result of this paper: If P $\neq$ NP then one can invert some functions that are strongly noninvertible.

Theorem 3.2 *If* P $\neq$ NP *then there exists a total, honest 2-ary function that is a strongly one-way function but not a one-way function.*

Proof. Assuming P $\neq$ NP, by Theorem 3.1 there exists a total 2-ary one-way function ρ. Define a function $\sigma : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ as follows:

$$\sigma(a,b) = \begin{cases} 0\rho(x,y) & \text{if } (\exists x,y,z \in \Sigma^*)\,[a = 1\langle x,y\rangle \wedge b = 0z] \\ 0\rho(y,z) & \text{if } (\exists x,y,z \in \Sigma^*)\,[a = 0x \wedge b = 1\langle y,z\rangle] \\ 1xy & \text{if } (\exists x,y \in \Sigma^*)\,[(a = 0x \wedge b = 0y) \vee (a = 1x \wedge b = 1y)] \\ ab & \text{if } a = \epsilon \vee b = \epsilon. \end{cases}$$

It is a matter of routine to check that σ is polynomial-time computable, total, honest, and s-honest (regardless of whether or not ρ, which is honest, is s-honest).

If one could invert σ with respect to one of its arguments then one could invert ρ, contradicting that ρ is a one-way function. In particular, supposing σ is invertible with respect to the first argument via inverter $g_1 \in$ FP, we can use g_1 to define a function $g \in$ FP that inverts ρ. To see this, note that given any $w \in \text{image}(\rho)$ with $w \neq \epsilon$, $g_1(\langle 0, 0w\rangle)$ must yield a string of the form $b = 1\langle y,z\rangle$ with $\rho(y,z) = w$. Thus, σ is not invertible with respect to the first argument. An analogous argument shows that σ is not invertible with respect to the second argument. Thus, σ is strongly noninvertible. However, σ is invertible, since every string $z \in \text{image}(\sigma)$ has an inverse of the form (ϵ, z); so, the FP function mapping any given string z to (ϵ, z) is an inverter for σ. Hence, σ is not a one-way function. ∎

The converse of Theorem 3.2 immediately holds, as do the converses of Proposition 3.3, Corollary 3.5, and Theorems 3.4, 3.6, and 3.7. However, although all these results in fact are equivalences, we will focus on only the interesting implication direction.

For completeness, we mention in passing that, assuming P $\neq$ NP, one can construct functions that—unlike the function constructed in the proof of Theorem 3.2—are strongly one-way *and* one-way. An example of such a function is the following modification $\hat{\sigma}$ of the function σ constructed in the proof of Theorem 3.2. As in that proof, let ρ be a total 2-ary one-way function, and define function $\hat{\sigma} : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ by

$$\hat{\sigma}(a,b) = \begin{cases} 0\rho(x,y) & \text{if } (\exists x,y,z \in \Sigma^*)\,[a = 1\langle x,y\rangle \wedge b = 0z] \\ 0\rho(y,z) & \text{if } (\exists x,y,z \in \Sigma^*)\,[a = 0x \wedge b = 1\langle y,z\rangle] \\ 1ab & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $\hat{\sigma}$ even is overstrong; hence, $\hat{\sigma}$ is both noninvertible and strongly noninvertible. That is:

Proposition 3.3 *If* P $\neq$ NP *then there exists a total, honest, s-honest, 2-ary overstrong function. (It follows that if* P $\neq$ NP *then there exists a total 2-ary function that is one-way and strongly one-way.)*

Corollary 3.5 below shows that if P $\neq$ NP then there is an s-honest 2-ary one-way function that is not strongly one-way. First, we establish a result that is slightly stronger: For a function to be not strongly noninvertible, it is enough that it is invertible with respect to at least one of its arguments. The function σ to be constructed in the proof of Theorem 3.4 below even is invertible with respect to each of its arguments.

Theorem 3.4 *If* P $\neq$ NP *then there exists a total, s-honest 2-ary one-way function σ such that σ is invertible with respect to its first argument and σ is invertible with respect to its second argument.*

Proof. It is well-known ([Sel92, Prop. 1], in light of the many-to-one analog of his comment [Sel92, p. 209] about totality) that under the assumption P $\neq$ NP there exists a total 1-ary one-way function $\rho : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$. Define a function $\sigma : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ as follows:

$$\sigma(a,b) = \begin{cases} 1\rho(a) & \text{if } a = b \\ 0ab & \text{if } a \neq b. \end{cases}$$

Note that σ is polynomial-time computable, total, s-honest, and honest. If σ were invertible in polynomial time then ρ would be too; so, σ is a one-way function. However, σ is invertible with respect to each of its arguments. For an inverter with respect to the first argument, consider the function $g_1 : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ defined by

$$g_1(x) = \begin{cases} b & \text{if } (\exists a,b,z \in \Sigma^*)\,[x = \langle a, 0z\rangle \wedge z = ab] \\ a & \text{if } (\exists a,z \in \Sigma^*)\,[x = \langle a, 1z\rangle] \\ \epsilon & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $g_1 \in$ FP. Note that for every $y \in \text{image}(\sigma)$ and for every $a \in \Sigma^*$ for which there exists some $b \in \Sigma^*$ with $\sigma(a,b) = y$, it holds that $\sigma(a, g_1(\langle a, y\rangle)) = y$, completing the proof

that σ is invertible with respect to the first argument. To see that σ also is invertible with respect to the second argument, an analogous construction (with the roles of the first and the second argument interchanged) works to give an inverter g_2 for a fixed second argument. ∎

Corollary 3.5 *If* P $\neq$ NP *then there exists a total, s-honest 2-ary one-way function that is not strongly one-way.*

One might wonder whether functions that are not strongly noninvertible (which means they are invertible with respect to at least one of their arguments) outright must be invertible with respect to both of their arguments. The following result states that this is not the case, unless P = NP.

Theorem 3.6 *If* P $\neq$ NP *then there exists a total, s-honest 2-ary one-way function that is invertible with respect to one of its arguments (thus, it is not strongly one-way), yet that is not invertible with respect to its other argument.*

Proof. Assuming P $\neq$ NP, by Theorem 3.1 there exists a total 2-ary one-way function, call it ρ. Since our pairing function is onto and one-to-one, and its inverses are efficiently computable, the functions—π_1 and π_2—mapping from each string in Σ^* to that string's first and second components when interpreted as a pair are well-defined, total, polynomial-time functions; for all $b \in \Sigma^*$, $b = \langle \pi_1(b), \pi_2(b) \rangle$. Define a function $\sigma : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ as follows:

$$\sigma(a, b) = \rho(\pi_1(b), \pi_2(b))$$

It is clear that σ is honest (via ρ's honesty) and s-honest. Let a_0 be any fixed string, and define $g_2(w) = a_0$ for all strings w. Clearly, $g_2 \in$ FP. The definition of σ implies that for each $z = \rho(x, y) \in \text{image}(\sigma)$ and for each $b \in \Sigma^*$ such that $\sigma(a, b) = z$ for some $a \in \Sigma^*$, it also holds that $\sigma(a_0, b) = z$. Thus, σ is invertible with respect to the second argument via g_2. However, if σ were also invertible with respect to the first argument via some function $g_1 \in$ FP, then g_1 could be used to invert ρ, which would contradict the noninvertibility of ρ. Hence, σ is invertible with respect to its first, yet not with respect to its second argument. Analogously, we can define a function that is invertible with respect to its second argument, yet not with respect to its first argument. ∎

Finally, let us turn to the notion of overstrongness (see Definition 2.3) mentioned in the last paragraph of the introduction. As noted there, this notion is not less restrictive than either noninvertibility or strong noninvertibility, and so if a given polynomial-time computable, honest, s-honest function is overstrong then it certainly is both one-way and strongly one-way. Notwithstanding the fact that—as we have argued—overstrongness is not well-motivated by the cryptographic protocols of Rabi, Rivest, and Sherman [RS97], for the purpose of showing that the notions do not collapse, we will prove that the converse does not hold, unless P = NP.

Theorem 3.7 *If* P $\neq$ NP *then there exists a total, honest, s-honest 2-ary function that is noninvertible and strongly noninvertible but that is not overstrong.*

Proof. Assume P $\neq$ NP. It is known (see [Sel92]) that this assumption implies that total 1-ary one-way functions exist. Let $\widehat{\rho}$ be one such function, and let $\widehat{\rho}$ be such that it additionally satisfies $(\exists r \geq 2)\,(\forall x \in \Sigma^*)\,[|\widehat{\rho}(x)| = |x|^r + r]$. Henceforth, r will denote this value r. That this condition can be required follows easily from the standard "accepting-paths-based" proofs that P $\neq$ NP implies the existence of total 1-ary one-way functions.

Define a total function $\rho : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ as follows:

$$\rho(a) = \begin{cases} 1\widehat{\rho}(x) & \text{if } (\exists x \in \Sigma^*)\,[a = 1x] \\ a & \text{if } (\exists x \in \Sigma^*)\,[a = 0x] \\ \epsilon & \text{if } a = \epsilon. \end{cases}$$

Note that ρ is a 1-ary, total one-way function satisfying that for each $i \geq 0$, $\rho(0^i) = 0^i$. Now define the total function $\sigma : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ as follows:

$$\sigma(a,b) = \begin{cases} 1\langle \rho(x), 0^{|y|} \rangle & \text{if } (\exists x, y \in \Sigma^*)\,[|x| = |y| \wedge a = 0\langle x, y\rangle = b] \\ 1\langle \rho(x), 0^{|y|} \rangle & \text{if } (\exists x, y \in \Sigma^*)\,[|x| = |y| \wedge a = 1\langle x, 0y\rangle \wedge b = 1\langle x, 1\widehat{\rho}(y)\rangle)] \\ 1\langle \rho(x), 0^{|y|} \rangle & \text{if } (\exists x, y \in \Sigma^*)\,[|x| = |y| \wedge a = 1\langle x, 1\widehat{\rho}(y)\rangle \wedge b = 1\langle x, 0y\rangle] \\ 0\langle a, b\rangle & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, σ is polynomial-time computable, honest, s-honest, and commutative. If σ were invertible, ρ would be too. Thus, σ is a one-way function.

Note that σ is strongly noninvertible, for if it could be inverted with respect to either argument then $\widehat{\rho}$ could be inverted too. Suppose, for example, σ were invertible with respect to the first argument via inverter $g_1 \in$ FP. Then $\widehat{\rho}$ could be inverted as follows. Given any $z \in \Sigma^*$, if there is no $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k^r + r = |z|$, there is no inverse of z under $\widehat{\rho}$; so, in that case we may output anything. Otherwise (i.e., there is a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k^r + r = |z|$), run g_1 on input $\langle a, w\rangle$, where $a = 1\langle 0^k, 1z\rangle$ and $w = 1\langle 0^k, 0^k\rangle$. By the definition of σ, if $z \in \text{image}(\widehat{\rho})$, the result of $g_1(\langle a, w\rangle)$ must be of the form $1\langle 0^k, 0\hat{z}\rangle$ for some preimage $\hat{z}$ of z under $\widehat{\rho}$, and we can verify this by running $\widehat{\rho}$ on input $\hat{z}$ and checking whether or not $\widehat{\rho}(\hat{z}) = z$. A similar argument shows that σ is not invertible with respect to the second argument. Hence, σ is strongly one-way.

Finally, we claim that σ is not overstrong. Here is what an inverter f does when given $i = 1$,[5] an alleged first argument $a \in \Sigma^*$ of σ, and an alleged output $z \in \Sigma^*$ of σ:

$$f(1,a,z) = \begin{cases} (x, y) & \text{if } (\exists x, y \in \Sigma^*)\,[z = 0\langle x, y\rangle] \\ (a, a) & \text{if } (\exists x, y \in \Sigma^*)\,(\exists m \in \mathbb{N})\,[a = 0x \wedge z = 1\langle y, 0^m\rangle] \\ (0\langle w, w\rangle, 0\langle w, w\rangle) & \text{if } (\exists w, x, y \in \Sigma^*)\,(\exists m \in \mathbb{N})\,[a = 1\langle w, 0x\rangle \wedge z = 1\langle y, 0^m\rangle] \\ (0\langle w, w\rangle, 0\langle w, w\rangle) & \text{if } (\exists w, x, y \in \Sigma^*)\,(\exists m \in \mathbb{N})\,[a = 1\langle w, 1x\rangle \wedge z = 1\langle y, 0^m\rangle] \\ (\epsilon, \epsilon) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

[5] Since σ is commutative, this implicitly also shows how to handle the case $i = 2$.

Note that $f \in \mathrm{FP}$. Whenever there exists some string $b \in \Sigma^*$ for which $\sigma(a,b) = z$, it holds that $\sigma(f(1,a,z)) = z$. (If there is no such b, it does not matter what $f(1,a,z)$ outputs.) Hence σ is not overstrong. ∎

Acknowledgments: We thank Osamu Watanabe for mentioning to us the notions, different from those used here though slightly reminiscent, from average-case theory, of claw-free collections, collision-free pseudorandom generators, and collision-free hash functions. We thank Chris Homan for suggesting overstrongness.

References

[BDG95] J. Balcázar, J. Díaz, and J. Gabarró. *Structural Complexity I.* EATCS Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. Springer-Verlag, second edition, 1995.

[GS88] J. Grollmann and A. Selman. Complexity measures for public-key cryptosystems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 17(2):309–335, 1988.

[Hom00] C. Homan. Low ambiguity in strong, total, associative, one-way functions. Technical Report TR-734, University of Rochester, Department of Computer Science, Rochester, NY, August 2000.

[HR99] L. Hemaspaandra and J. Rothe. Creating strong, total, commutative, associative one-way functions from any one-way function in complexity theory. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 58(3):648–659, 1999.

[KRS88] B. Kaliski Jr., R. Rivest, and A. Sherman. Is the data encryption standard a group? (Results of cycling experiments on DES). *Journal of Cryptology*, 1(1):3–36, 1988.

[RS93] M. Rabi and A. Sherman. Associative one-way functions: A new paradigm for secret-key agreement and digital signatures. Technical Report CS-TR-3183/UMIACS-TR-93-124, Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 1993.

[RS97] M. Rabi and A. Sherman. An observation on associative one-way functions in complexity theory. *Information Processing Letters*, 64(2):239–244, 1997.

[Sel92] A. Selman. A survey of one-way functions in complexity theory. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 25(3):203–221, 1992.

[She86] A. Sherman. *Cryptology and VLSI (a Two-Part Dissertation).* PhD thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 1986. Available as Technical Report MIT/LCS/TR-381.